

THE STATE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

Charangattu Bhavan, Building No.38/2829,
Mamangalam-Anchumana Road,
Edappally, Kochi-682 024
www.keralaeo.org Ph: 0484 2346488, Mob: 8714356488
Email: ombudsman.electricity@gmail.com

APPEAL PETITION No. P/018/2022**(Present: A. Chandrakumaran Nair)****Dated: 17th June, 2022**

Appellant : Smt. Lakshmi Mohan,
Proprietor,
Sree-Lakshmi Polymers,
VI/637B, Vathyapilly Road,
Udayamperoor P.O.,
Ernakulam Dist. 682 307

Respondent : Assistant Executive Engineer,
Electrical Sub Division, KSEB Ltd.,
Tripunithura, Ernakulam Dist.

ORDER**Background of the case:**

The appellant is a consumer of Electrical Section, KSEB Ltd., Udayamperoor with consumer number 1155496011881 availing the LT power supply under LT IV(A) tariff. The sanctioned load for the appellant is 103.75 kW and Contract Demand is 80 kW. On 12-07-2021, the Anti-Power Theft Squad (APTS), Ernakulam unit together with the officials of KSEB Ltd., Electrical Section, Udayamperoor inspected in the premises of the appellant and found that there is an anomaly of reversal of voltage at 2 phases in the CT circuit. In the three CTs one is cast resin type and two are wire wound type. The respondent connected a parallel meter for some time and found that the meter is under reading around 37%. Site mahassar was prepared in the presence of appellant's representative. Subsequently, a letter claiming Rs.62,63,677/- was given to the appellant towards short assessment charges, stating that the CT connection interchanged in two phases. The appellant filed a petition before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF), Central Region, Ernakulam vide OP No.46/2021-22 dated 25-10-2021 and the Forum in its order dated 18.02.2022 ordered that the petitioner is bound to pay the short

assessment bill issued by the Licensee. The respondent shall grant 12 months instalments as requested by the petitioner.

Aggrieved by the decision of the Forum, the appellant filed the appeal petition before this Authority.

Arguments of the appellant:

Original connection was during March 2003. Meter was intact and the CT with ratio 200/5 was used and hence, the Multiplication Factor is 40. ToD meter was replaced on 22-01-2011 along with CTs. On inspection of the appellant's LT connection under LT IVA tariff by APTS, Ernakulam on 12-07-2021, they found that Y & B phases of CTs voltage terminal interchanged. The appellant was made payment regularly based on ToD meter reading. No mistake is seen from the appellant and as such the appellant should not be penalized.

As per Supply Code 115 (3) & (6), the Licensee has to check the three-phase meter and CT once in every three years, which was not practically done by the Licensee.

The appellant argued that the mistake is happened from the staff of Licensee, they waited for 10 years to charge huge amount. This is negligence of duty from Licensee. The appellant was running PVC pipe manufacturing facility and the cost of the PVC pipe is fixed based on the cost of raw-materials and energy charges. Two years arrears are ready to pay in instalments of 24 Nos. If this provision is not applicable, the arrears of 10 years could be payable by 10 years only. The argument that the pipe manufacturing facility is a small industry which making livelihood for somany families. The huge burden for the electricity charges will affect this industry and hence, these families.

As per Kerala State Electricity Supply Code 2014, Section 125 (1) "Procedure for billing in the case of defective or damaged meter - In the case of defective or damaged meter, the consumer shall be billed on the basis of average consumption of the past three billing cycles immediately preceding the date of the meter being found or reported defective: Provided that, the average shall be computed from the three billing cycles after the meter is replaced if required details pertaining to previous billing cycles are not available", hence, the Licensee cannot

penalize the appellant without proper evidence. The Licensee have installed a Check Meter and readings are being taken. Hence, previous six months reading can be worked out as average of further three months reading, provided the Licensee is submitting the test certificate of Check Meter.

As per the CEA Metering Regulation 2006, 2 (P) "meter" means a device suitable for measuring, indicating and recording consumption of electricity or any other quantity related with electrical system and shall include, wherever applicable, other equipment such as Current Transformer (CT), Voltage Transformer (CVT) necessary for such purpose'. Here as per Licensee, the fault is in line connecting the current/voltage line 'which is a part of meter and hence the proceedings for the meter faulty period can only be adapted while claiming the short assessment bill. The Licensee declared the meter as faulty with 37% error for certain periods and they have assessed the full consumption percentage from 12 months of 2011. The Licensee have not tested the meter and CT in standard test lab and produced the test certificate.

As per Supply Code 2014 Reg.115 (9), which states that 'In case the meter is found to be faulty, revision of the bill on the basis of the test report shall be done for a maximum period of six months or from the date of last testing, whichever is shorter and the excess or deficit charges on account of such revision shall be adjusted in the two subsequent bills. The Licensee cannot charge more than 6 months, if the meter is found faulty. The meter is not tested in accredited laboratory and the MRI data are not downloaded to conclude the error. A poor consumer cannot be made liable for noncompliance of the directive of KSERC, CEA, etc. by the officials of the Licensee.

(a) The Regulation 115(9) which reduces maximum period of back assessment as 6 months, in case of meter faulty even if the meter faulty is more than 6 months.

(b) It is true that Regulation 134(1) permit Licensee to collect the undercharged amount 'if the Licensee establishes either by review or otherwise that it has undercharged the consumer, the licensee may recover the amount so undercharged from the consumer by issuing a bill and in such case at least thirty days shall be given to the consumer for making payment of the bill'. But nowhere

it is mentioned that KSEBL can have a claim after operational violation of Regulation and non-compliance of directives. Licensee can collect the payment only in compliance with Regulations 115(9). Once a specific remedy or direction is available, the appellant cannot go after a general remedy or direction.

Relief Sought

1. Direct Licensee not to disconnect the supply till hearing ad disposal of the petition.
2. The Ombudsman may cancel impugned bill.
3. The Ombudsman may direct Licensee to take the average of the actual consumption, when the meter is correct, may be computed for previous six months and to collect the payment for the same.
4. 24 months' equal instalment may be given without interest if six months payment is to be made.

Arguments of the respondent:

The appellant challenges the demand notice dated 4/8/2021 issued by the respondent under Sec. 45 of the Electricity Act 2003 read with Regulation 134 of the Kerala State Electricity Supply Code 2014 demanding the appellant to pay an amount of Rs.62,63,677/- as short assessment charges towards the actual energy consumed in the premises of the appellant on account of the fact that there is phase association mismatch of voltage between Y and B phases in the CT meter installed in their premise. The inspection conducted on 12-7-2021 revealed the anomaly of reversal of voltage at 2 phases in the CT circuit and the consumer was issued with short assessment bill on 4-8-2021.

There is no bona fides in the above complaint and the demand raised against the consumer is valid in all aspects. The demand raised is pertaining to the actual energy charges liable to be paid against the actual consumption in the premises that escaped assessment since the bills were being issued not against the actual without knowing the occurrence of phase association mismatch of voltage between Y and B phases. The premise of the appellant was inspected by the APTS Ernakulam unit on 12.07.2021, which revealed that due to the voltage connection interchange between Y and B phases, the actual energy recorded in existing CT

meter was less by 58.56 % when compared with ZERA make standard meter calibrated at Electrical Inspectorate. On account of this error in connection, the appellant was being served with inaccurate electricity bills and the appellant was not paying the actual energy charges for the energy consumed in the premises. Since the amounts paid were less than the actual, the licensee was suffering loss. The said anomaly was detected only on 12/07/2021 when an inspection took place in the premises. Upon detecting the anomaly, site mahazar has been prepared and thereafter the undercharged amounts were assessed and consumer has been issued with appropriate short assessment bill. The demand notice is accompanied by the calculation details of the assessment by which the undercharged amount has been arrived. The copy of the site mahazar prepared has been duly served on the consumer at the end of the inspection. The inspection and demand raised is perfectly valid and done as per law. The appellant is liable to remunerate the demand made through the demand notice.

On detecting the anomaly on 12.07.2021, the actual energy charges payable by the consumer was calculated from the date of last system change/meter change I.e 12/2011 and a short assessment bill of Rs.Rs.62,63,677 was served on the consumer under Sec.45 of the Electricity Act 2003 r/w Regulation 134 of the Kerala State Electricity Supply Code, taking the period of assessment from 12/2011. The demand notice dated 4/8/2021 served on the appellant was accompanied by the calculation details of the assessment by which the undercharged amount has been arrived.

Electricity is supplied to the consumers against the price fixed for it as per the tariff notified by the regulatory commission. The obligation of the consumer to pay electricity charge arises when a bill is issued by the licensee upon quantifying the charges that is to be paid. The act or law does not permit the consumer to make an unlawful gain without paying for the energy consumed. On 12.07.2021, the licensee discovered that the consumer has not being issued with the actual bill right from 12/2011. Consequently, supplementary demand has been made for recovering the undercharged amounts by taking recourse to the enabling statutes under Sec.45 of the Electricity Act 2003 and regulation 134 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 for the entire period during which such anomaly persisted.

On analyzing the law governing the situation it can be seen that section 45 (2) of the Act deals with charges for electricity supplied by the Distribution licensee. The section enables the distribution licensee to recover the charges for the supply of electricity by him by virtue of Sec.43. Accordingly, the licensee is entitled to recover the charges for the supply of electricity once it realizes and establish that the consumer has been undercharged and actual charges has not been recovered from the consumer. The Section takes into its sweep the power for recovery of undercharged amounts also. Accordingly, the Regulatory Commission has made regulation 134 of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code, 2014 enabling the licensee to recover the amount so undercharged from the consumer by issuing a bill. Section 50 of the Act speaks about electricity supply code. As per the said section, the State Commission shall specify an Electricity Supply Code to provide for recovery of Electricity charges, intervals for billing of the electrical charges, disconnection for supply of electricity for nonpayment thereof, the restoration of supply of electricity, measures for preventing tampering, distress or damage to electric plant or electric line or meter, entry of distribution licensee or any person acting on his behalf for disconnecting supply and removing the meter, entry for replacing, altering or maintaining electric lines or electrical plants or meter and such other matters. Here also no power is given to limit the period for under-recovery. Section 61 authorizes the Regulatory Commission to specify the terms and conditions for determination of tariff within the parameters. Section 62 deals with the procedure for fixing tariff. Section 64 deals with the actual procedure of determination of tariff under Section 62. A conjoint reading of all the above said sections would show that once tariff regulation is issued, any consumer consuming electricity is bound to pay for the electricity in accordance with the tariff regulation. The language envisaged in Section 45 unambiguously enables the licensee to recover the charges payable by the consumer against the supply of electricity and no period of limitation is contemplated anywhere in the Act for recovery of the charges due against the supply of electricity. Therefore, the appellant has absolute liability to remunerate the short-assessment bill issued by the licensee.

Payment for the electricity consumed in the premises is an obligation under taken by the consumer while availing the supply. Further, the service connection agreement executed by the appellant enables the licensee to recover the charges

for the electricity consumed by him. It is to be noted that under Section 126 of the Act dealing with misuse of energy, recovery can be made for the entire period during which such unauthorized use of electricity has taken place. So also Section 56 dealing with disconnection of supply in default of payment says that when any person neglects to pay any charge for electricity or any sum other than charge for electricity due from him to a licensee or generating company in respect of supply, transmission or distribution or wheeling of electricity to him, the Licensee or generating company may after giving not less than 15 clear days' notice in writing to such person and without prejudice to his rights to recover such charges or other sum by suit, cut off the supply of electricity and for that purpose cut or disconnect any electric supply line or other works being the property of such Licensee together with any expenses incurred by him in cutting of and reconnecting the supply. The only restriction contained in Sub Section (2) of Section of Section 56 which says that notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force no sum due from any consumer under this section shall be recoverable after the period of 2 years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrear of charges for electricity supply. Thus, it can be seen that going by the relevant provisions in the Electricity Act 2003 there is no restriction in recovering the actual charges of electricity as determined by the tariff order. In the case on hand the licensee discovered the undercharging of the consumer due to the inaccuracy in the meter reading on 12/07/2021 and thereafter issued additional demand on 04/08/2021. Therefore, the sum became due only on 04/08/2021 on identifying the mistake. As per Sec. 17 (1) © of the limitation Act, 1963, in case of a mistake, the limitation period begins to run from the date when the mistake is discovered for the first time. Therefore, if the consumer neglects to pay the demand of short assessment bill, the licensee is open to take recourse to the remedies available in law for recovery of the additional demand.

The demand made by the licensee is not hit by any of the principles of limitation and the right of the licensee to issue a supplementary demand and recover the charges has been clearly upheld by the Apex Court in the judgment rendered in Civil Appeal No. 1672/2020 in the matter of Assistant Engineer, Ajmer Vidyut Vitharan Ltd & Another Vs. Rahmathulla Khan (2020 (4) SCC 650) and that

of in Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009 in the matter of M/s. Prem Cottex Vs. Hariyana Bijli Vitaran Nigam Ltd & Others decided on 05-10-2021. The scope and ambit of Section 56 was interpreted by the Apex Court in the aforesaid decisions and in the later it was conclusively held that what is covered by Sec.56, under sub section 1, is the negligence on the part of a person to pay for electricity and not anything else nor any negligence on the part of the licensee. In other words, the negligence on part of the licensee which led to short billing in the first instance and the rectification of the same after the mistake is detected, is not covered by Sub Section 1 of Section 56. Consequently, any claim so made by the licensee after the detection of their mistakes may not fall within the mischief, namely, "No sum due from any consumer under this section", appearing in Sub section 2. The Apex Court also examined the scope and ambit of section 56 (1) in another angle and held that Sub section 1 of sec.56, deals with disconnection of electric supply if any person "neglects to pay any charge for electricity". The question of neglect to pay would arise only after a demand is raised by the licensee. If the demand is not raised there is no occasion for a consumer to neglect to pay any charges for electrified. Sub sec.2 of sec.56 has a non-obstante clause with respect to what is contained in any other law regarding the right to recover including the right to recover including the right to disconnect. Therefore, if the licensee has not raised any bill, there can be no negligence on the part of the consumer to pay bill and consequently the period of limitation prescribed under sub section 2 will not start running. So long as limitation has not started running the bar for recovery and disconnection will not come into effect. At paragraph 6 of the former decision, Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that the Electricity Act 2003 is a self-contained comprehensive legislation. It was further observed at paragraph 6.6 that the liability to pay arises on the consumption of electricity and obligation to pay would arise when the bill is issued by the licensee company quantifying the charges to be paid. At paragraph 8, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that Section 56(2) does not preclude the licensee company from raising a supplementary demand after the expiry of limitation period of 2 years. It only restricts the right of the licensee to disconnect Electricity Supply due to non-payment of dues after the period of limitation of 2 years has expired. It does not restrict other modes of recovery which may be initiated by the licensee company for recovery of supplementary demand. In the above said case the licensee company discovered a mistake in billing under

a wrong tariff code on 18-3-2014 and a bill for the period from July 2009 to September 2011 was raised. The Supreme Court held that the licensee company might take recourse to any remedy available in Law for recovery of additional demand. Further the Supreme Court relied on Section 17(1) (c) of the Limitation Act 1963 and held that in case of a mistake, the limitation period begins to run from the date when the mistake is discovered for the first time. Applying the aforesaid said principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the aforementioned decisions the Electricity Board is empowered to collect the differential amount of electricity charged from the inception till its is detected and rectified.

The fact that the appellant has consumed electricity supplied by the respondent is not in dispute. The period of supply is also not in dispute. The CT operated static meter installed at the premise is one having a ratio of 200/5 supplied by the consumer. The Regulatory Commission has provided regulation 134 for effectively working out Sec.45 of the Electricity Act 2003. The said regulation has been incorporated under Chapter VII of the Supply Code 2014 which enumerates the billing and mode of payment. Further Regulation 136 under the said chapter in clear terms gives power to the licensee to recover arrears of charges or any other amount due from the consumer along with interest at the rates applicable for the belated payments from the date of which such payments became due. Therefore, the applicable law with regard to the case at hand is Sec.45 of the Electricity Act r/w the Provisions enumerated under Chapter VII of the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014.

The Honourable High court of Jharkand in M/s Sheo Shakthi Cement Industries, Jharkand Vs. Jharkand Urja Vikas Nigam Limited (Reported in AIR 2016 jharkand 98) has held that *“the contention that the bills for the period between 29.01.2011 to 31.03.2014 were paid by the petitioner and thus, supplementary bill dated 04/06/2014 is barred under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act 2003 cannot be accepted. The petitioner has consumed electricity supplied by respondent Nigam is not in dispute. The Installation Report dated 27.01.2011 discloses the particulars of the CTPT metering Unit which was installed on 27.01.2011 and those particulars are corroborated by the Installation Report on 31.01.2014 and therefore, the petitioner cannot avoid payment for the electricity consumed by it. The*

supplementary bill dated 13.05.2014 as corrected by bill dated 04.06.2014 raised on account of less Multiplication Factor is not barred under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act 2003". In the case on hand also, it is clearly revealed that the error in connection was not detected and regular bills were issued wrongly and anomaly detected on 12/7/2021. Hence short-assessment was done for the period from 12/2011 to 7/2021 is legitimate one and binding on the appellant.

The Licensee is bound to abide by the statutes and is bound to recover the unbilled portion of the consumption and the same amounts to public money. As far as State of Kerala is concerned it is a power-starved state wherein the deficit electricity is outsourced at exorbitant rate from across the nation. As of now the licensee is facing severe financial stringency on account of the large amounts due from the consumers across the state and the licensee is running deficit of its income. Therefore, the licensee is bound to recover the charges for the electricity supplied from the consumer in terms with the tariff fixed by the regulatory commission for its survival and effective distribution of electricity to its consumers throughout the state. The appellant is capable of paying the amounts demanded. None of the contentions raised in the complaint disputing the right of the licensee to enforce the payment of undercharged amounts are tenable and the appellant is not entitled for any reliefs. There is no dispute with regard to the efficiency of the meter in the premises and there is no change of any ownership in the premise.

Considering the above facts, the answering respondent request this Forum to accept the contentions raised through this statement of facts and dismiss the above complaint with cost to the respondents and, declare that the short assessment bill issued is in order and to direct the appellant to pay the short-assessment amount Rs.62,63,677/-. It is also prayed that this Forum may be pleased to dismiss the complaint and permit KSEBL to rectify the connection error and to make the metering system working properly and remove the parallel meter installed in the premises and issue appropriate bills.

Analysis and findings:

The hearing of the case was conducted on 13-06-2022 in the office of the State Electricity Ombudsman, Edappally, Kochi. Smt. Sreelakshmi Mohan, Sarth Krishnan, Sanoj K.N., were attended the hearing for the appellant and Sri.

Sajeevan. K.S., Assistant Engineer, Electrical Section, Udayamperoor and Sri. V. Premod, Advocate of Licensee were attended the hearing from the respondent's side. On examining the appeal petition, the arguments filed by the appellant, the statement of facts of the respondent, perusing the documents attached and considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, this Authority comes to the following findings and conclusions leading to the decision thereof.

On 12-07-2021, the APTS, Ernakulam and the Licensee inspected in the premises of the appellant and found that the interchanging of 'Y' & 'B' phases are resulted the mismatching of voltage and current and hence the reading was only 63.065% (800 units against actual of 1268.53 units) of the actual consumption. The appellant has raised the objection of short assessment bill effective from December 2011 as the Clause No.152 (2) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code states about the "Anomalies attributable to the licensee which are detected at the premises of the consumer by which the arrears short collected shall be limited for a maximum period of twenty-four months, even if the period during which such anomaly persisted is found to be more than twenty-four months".

152. Anomalies attributable to the licensee which are detected at the premises of the consumer:-

- (1) Anomalies attributable to the licensee which are detected on inspection at the premises of the consumer, such as wrong application of multiplication factor, incorrect application of tariff by the licensee even while there is no change in the purpose of use of electricity by the consumer and inaccuracies in metering shall not attract provisions of Section 126 of the Act or of Section 135 of the Act.
- (2) In such cases, the amount of electricity charges short collected by the licensee, if any, shall only be realized from the consumer under normal tariff applicable to the period during which such anomalies persisted.
- (3) The amount of electricity charges short collected for the entire period during which such anomalies persisted, may be realized by the licensee without any interest:

Provided that, if the period of such short collection due to the anomalies is not known or cannot be reliably assessed, the period of assessment of such short collection of electricity charges shall be limited to twelve months:

Provided further that while assessing the period of such short collection the factors as specified in sub-regulation (8) of regulation 155 shall be considered:

Provided also that realization of electricity charges short collected shall be limited for a maximum period of twenty-four months, even if the period during which such anomaly persisted is found to be more than twenty-four months.

- (4) The consumer may be given installment facility by the licensee for a maximum period of twelve months without interest for the remittance of such amount of short collection.

At the same time, as per Clause 134(1) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014, the Licensee has the right to recover the amount so undercharged from the consumer by issuing a bill.

“134. Under charged bills and over charged bills: -

- (1) If the licensee establishes either by review or otherwise, that it has undercharged the consumer, the licensee may recover the amount so undercharged from the consumer by issuing a bill and in such cases at least thirty days shall be given to the consumer for making payment of the bill.”

Section 45 of Indian Electricity Act 2003 gives the power to the Licensee to recover the charges for the power supply of the consumer.

Section 45. (Power to recover charges): (1) Subject to the provisions of this section, the prices to be charged by a distribution licensee for the supply of electricity by him in pursuance of section 43 shall be in accordance with such tariffs fixed from time to time and conditions of his licence.”

The appellant has raised question that the meters have to be inspected periodically by the concerned officials of the Licensee. Clause 113(6) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 states that:-

113 (6) The licensee shall conduct periodical inspection or testing or both of the meters as per the following schedule:-

single phase meters	once in every five years
LT 3-phase meters	once in every three years
HT or EHT meters including maximum demand indicator (MDI)	once in every year

As per the Centre Electricity Authority Regulations 18 (2), the periodical testing of the meters also to be done by the officials of the Licensee within 5 years.

As per this clause the Licensee is mandated to test the meters periodically. If this regulation is abided by the Licensee, the huge burden on the appellant would have not arisen. The contention of Licensee mentioning the Regulation 120 and Regulation 21 of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 are not relevant here as the connection was given by the Licensee and the meters having an inside sealed chamber, which is not accessible to the appellant. The Licensee has to check the healthiness of the meter by monitoring the LED as per Regulation 110(7) of Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014.

The contention of the appellant is that whether the limitation of time as per Clause 152 (3) is applicable in this case or not. It is pertinent to refer the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the Civil Appeal No. 7235 of 2009 M/s. Prem Cottex Vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. & Others. The scope and ambit of Section 56 of Indian Electricity Act 2003 was interpreted by the Apex Court in the aforesaid decisions and in the later it was conclusively held that what is covered by Section 56 (1), is the negligence on the part of a person to pay for electricity and not anything else nor any negligence on the part of the Licensee. Para 11 & 12 of the said order clearly spelt out that electricity charges could become "first due" only after the bill is issued, even though the liability would have arisen on consumption. Then the period of limitation of two years would commence from the date on which the electricity charges become first due under Section 56(2). This Hon'ble Court also held that Section 56(2) does not preclude the Licensee from rising an additional or supplementary demand after the expiry of period of limitation in the case of a mistake or bonafide error.

Section 136(1) of the Kerala State Electricity Supply Code clearly state recovering the arrears of charges from the consumers at the rates applicable as follow:

"136 (1) Recovery of arrears and its limitation – "The licensee shall be entitled to recover arrears of charges or any other amount due from the consumer along with interest at the rates applicable for belated payments from the date on which such payments became due." Accordingly, the Licensee can recover the short assessment bill after the expiry of the limitation period.

Decision: -

From the analysis of the arguments and the hearing, following decisions are hereby taken:

- (1) The appellant is liable to pay the short assessment bill amount.
- (2) The respondent shall grant 60 numbers of monthly instalments without interest to pay the short assessment bill by the appellant to the Licensee.
- (3) The order of CGRF, Central Region in OP No.46/2021-22 dated 18-02-2022 is modified to this extent.
- (4) The Licensee has to device a proper and rugged system to ensure that the meters and CTs are connected properly and also ensure that the periodical inspection and testing of meters as specified in the Kerala Electricity Supply Code 2014 is meticulously followed.

Having concluded and decided as above, it is ordered accordingly. No order on costs.

ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

P/018/2022/_____ dated _____.

Delivered to:

1. Smt. Lakshmi Mohan, Proprietor, Sree-Lakshmi Polymers, VI/637B, Vathyapilly Rpoad, Udayamperoor P.O., Ernakulam Dist. 682 307
2. Assistant Executive Engineer, Electrical Sub Division, KSEB Ltd., Tripunithura, Ernakulam Dist.

Copy to:

1. The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Regulatory Commission, KPFC Bhavanam, Vellayambalam, Thiruvananthapuram-10.
2. The Secretary, KSE Board Limited, Vydhyuthi Bhavanam, Pattom, Thiruvananthapuram-4.
3. The Chairperson, CGRF-CR, 220 kV Substation Compound, KSE Board Limited, HMT Colony P.O., Kalamassery, PIN: 683 503.